arXiv:1403.4670v1 [cs.SY] 19 Mar 2014

Quantized Output Feedback Stabilization of Switched Linear Systems

Masashi Wakaiki and Yutaka Yamamoto *

March 20, 2014

Abstract

This paper studies the problem of stabilizing a continuous-time switched linear system by quantized output feedback. We assume that the quantized outputs and the switching signal are available to the controller at all time. We develop an encoding strategy by using multiple Lyapunov functions and an average dwell time property. The encoding strategy is based on the results in the case of a single mode, and it requires an additional adjustment of the "zoom" parameter at every switching time.

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the quantized control problem for switched systems. For linear time-invariant systems, various approaches to quantized control have been developed: Lyapunov-based methods [1–3], optimization with ℓ^∞ norm [4], etc. In contrast, few results of quantized control are generalized to switched systems in spite of a wide range of their applications. Recently, based on the results in [5] for a single mode, Liberzon [6] has developed an encoding and control strategy achieving the global asymptotic stability of sampled-data switched systems with quantized state feedback. Also, quantized state feedback stabilization is discussed for discrete-time Markov jump linear systems in [7–9]. However, stabilization of switched systems by quantized *output* feedback has not yet explored.

Here we consider a continuous-time switching linear system, whose quantized outputs and switching signal are transmitted to the controller at all times. The objective of this paper is to extend the encoding method of [2, 3] for non-switched systems. The key point of the earlier studies is that certain level sets of a Lyapunov function are invariant regions. The difficulty of switched systems is that such level sets change at every switching time. Therefore, at the "zooming-in" stage, non-switched systems require only periodic reduction of the "zoom" parameter of quantizers, whereas in switched systems, we need to adjust the parameter after each switch. We assume that the average dwell time [10] of the switching signal is large enough, and develop an output encoding for global asymptotic stabilization by using multiple Lyapunov functions.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we explain the components of the closed-loop system one by one and then give the main result, Theorem 2.4. Section III is devoted to its proof. We present a numerical example in Section IV and finally conclude this paper in Section V.

Notation: Let $\lambda_{\min}(P)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(P)$ denote the smallest and the largest eigenvalue of $P \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}\times\mathsf{n}}$. Let $M^\top$ denote the transpose of $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{m}\times\mathsf{n}}$.

The Euclidean norm of $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}}$ is denoted by $|v| = (v^*v)^{1/2}$. The Euclidean induced norm of $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{m}\times\mathsf{n}}$ is defined by $\|M\| = \sup\{|Mv| : \ v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}}, \ |v| = 1\}$, which equals the largest singular value of M.

For a piecewise continuous function $f : \ \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, its left-sided limit at $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\lim_{t\nearrow t_0} f(t)$.

2 QUANTIZED OUTPUT FEEDBACK STABILIZATION FOR SWITCHED SYSTEMS

In this section, we first define switched systems and construct quantizers and controllers based on the non-switched case in [3]. Next we present the main result, Theorem 2.4. This theorem guarantees the existence of a quantizer leading to the globally asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system under an average dwell time assumption.

*M. Wakaiki and Y. Yamamoto are with the Department of Applied Analysis and Complex Dynamical Systems, Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan (e-mail: wakaiki@acs.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp; yy@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp).

2.1 Switched linear systems

Consider the switched linear system

$$\dot{x} = A_\sigma x + B_\sigma u, \quad y = C_\sigma x, \tag{2.1}$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}}$ is the state, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{m}}$ is the control input, and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}}$ is the output. For a finite index set $\mathcal{P}$, $\sigma : [0, \infty) \to \mathcal{P}$ is right-continuous and piecewise constant. We call σ *switching signal* and the discontinuities of σ *switching times*. Let denote by $N_\sigma(t, s)$ the number of discontinuities of σ on the interval $(s, t]$.

Assumptions on the switched system (2.1) are as follows.

Assumption 2.1. *For every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, (A_p, B_p) is stabilizable and (C_p, A_p) is observable. We choose $K_p \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{m}\times\mathsf{n}}$ and $L_p \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}\times\mathsf{p}}$ so that $A_p + B_p K_p$ and $A_p + L_p C_p$ are Hurwitz.*

Furthermore, the switching signal σ has an average dwell time [10], i.e., there exist $\tau_a > 0$ and $N_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$N_\sigma(t, s) \leq N_0 + \frac{t - s}{\tau_a} \qquad (t > s \geq 0). \tag{2.2}$$

2.2 Quantizer

In this paper, we use the following class of quantizers proposed in [3].

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}}$. A quantizer is a piecewise constant function $q : \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}} \to \mathcal{Q}$. This geometrically implies that $\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}}$ is divided into the quantized regions $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}} : \ q(y) = y_i\}$ $(y_i \in \mathcal{Q})$. For the quantizer q, there exist positive numbers M and Δ with $M > \Delta$ such that

$$|y| \leq M \quad \Rightarrow \quad |q(y) - y| \leq \Delta \tag{2.3}$$

$$|y| > M \quad \Rightarrow \quad |q(y)| > M - \Delta. \tag{2.4}$$

The former condition (2.3) gives an upper bound of the quantization error when the quantizer is not saturated. The latter (2.4) is used for the detection of the saturation.

We make the following assumption on the behavior of the quantizer q near the origin:

Assumption 2.2 ([3,11])**.** *There exists $\Delta_0 > 0$ such that $q(y) = 0$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{p}}$ with $|y| \leq \Delta_0$.*

This assumption is necessary for the Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop system.

We give the above quantizers the following adjustable parameter $\mu > 0$:

$$q_\mu(y) = \mu q\left(\frac{y}{\mu}\right). \tag{2.5}$$

In (2.5), μ is regarded as a "zoom" variable, and $q_{\mu(t)}(y(t))$ is the data on $y(t)$ transmitted to the controller. We need to change μ to obtain accurate information of y. The reader can refer to [3, 11, 12] for further discussion.

Remark 2.3. The quantized output $q_\mu(y)$ may chatter on the boundaries among the quantization regions. Hence if we generate u by $q_\mu(y)$, the solutions of (2.1) must be interpreted in the sense of Filippov [13, 14]. However this generalization does not affect our Lyapunov-based analysis in this work, because we will work with a single quadratic Lyapunov function between switching times. See also [15], which presents a Lyapunov-based analysis with the generalized solutions for switched controller systems.

2.3 Construction of controllers

We construct the following dynamic output feedback law based on the standard Luenberger observers:

$$\dot{\xi} = (A_\sigma + L_\sigma C_\sigma)\xi + B_\sigma u - L_\sigma q_\mu(y), \quad u = K_\sigma \xi, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}}$ is the estimated state. Then the closed-loop system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= A_\sigma x + B_\sigma K_\sigma \xi \\ \dot{\xi} &= (A_\sigma + L_\sigma C_\sigma)\xi + B_\sigma K_\sigma \xi - L_\sigma q_\mu(y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

If we define z and F_σ by

$$z := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x - \xi \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_\sigma := \begin{bmatrix} A_\sigma + B_\sigma K_\sigma & -B_\sigma K_\sigma \\ 0 & A_\sigma + L_\sigma C_\sigma \end{bmatrix},$$



Figure 1: Continuous-time switched system with quantized output feedback.

then we rewrite (2.7) in the form

$$\dot{z} = F_\sigma z + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L_\sigma \end{bmatrix} (q_\mu(y) - y). \tag{2.8}$$

Since F_p is Hurwitz for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, there exist positive-definite matrices $P_p, Q_p \in \mathbb{R}^{2\mathsf{n}\times 2\mathsf{n}}$ such that

$$F_p^\top P_p + P_p F_p = -Q_p \qquad (p \in \mathcal{P}). \tag{2.9}$$

We define $\overline{\lambda}_P$, $\underline{\lambda}_P$, $\underline{\lambda}_Q$, and $C_{\max}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lambda}_P &:= \max_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \lambda_{\max}(P_p), \quad \underline{\lambda}_P := \min_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \lambda_{\min}(P_p), \\ \underline{\lambda}_Q &:= \min_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \lambda_{\min}(Q_p), \quad C_{\max} := \max_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \|C_p\|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

2.4 Main result

As in the non-switched case [3], by adjusting the "zoom" parameter μ, we can achieve the global asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system (2.8) in Fig. 1.

Theorem 2.4. *Define* Θ *by*

$$\Theta := \frac{2\max_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \|P_p \hat{L}_p\|}{\underline{\lambda}_Q}, \quad \textit{where} \quad \hat{L}_p := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L_p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.11}$$

and let M *be large enough to satisfy*

$$M > \max\left\{ 2\Delta, \quad \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\lambda}_P}{\underline{\lambda}_P}}\Theta\Delta C_{\max} \right\}. \tag{2.12}$$

If the average dwell time τ_a *is longer than a certain value, then there exists a piecewise constant function* μ *such that the closed-loop system* (2.8) *has the following two properties for every* $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{n}}$ *and every* $\sigma(0) \in \mathcal{P}$*:*

Convergence to the origin: $\lim_{t\to\infty} z(t) = 0$.

Lyapunov stability: To every $\varepsilon > 0$*, there corresponds* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$|x(0)| < \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad |z(t)| < \varepsilon \quad (t \geq 0).$$

In the next section, we shall prove Theorem 2.4 with the concrete construction of μ. The sufficient condition on τ_a is given by (3.25) below.

3 The proof of Theorem 2.4

Let us first consider the fixed "zoom" parameter μ. We obtain the following result on the state trajectories of each individual mode.

Lemma 3.1. Fix $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and consider the non-switched system

$$\dot{z} = F_p z + \hat{L}_p(q_\mu(y) - y). \tag{3.1}$$

Choose $\kappa > 0$, and suppose that M satisfies

$$\sqrt{\underline{\lambda}_P} M > \sqrt{\overline{\lambda}_P}\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa)C_{\max}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $C_{\max}$ and Θ are defined by (2.10) and (2.11), respectively. Then the two ellipsoids

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{R}_1(\mu,p) &:= \left\{ z : \ z^\top P_p z \le \frac{\underline{\lambda}_P M^2 \mu^2}{C_{\max}^2} \right\} \\ \mathscr{R}_2(\mu,p) &:= \left\{ z : \ z^\top P_p z \le \overline{\lambda}_P (\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa))^2 \mu^2 \right\}\end{aligned}$$

are invariant sets of every trajectory of (3.1). Furthermore, if T satisfies

$$T > \frac{\underline{\lambda}_P M^2 - \overline{\lambda}_P (\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa)C_{\max})^2}{\underline{\lambda}_Q \kappa(1+\kappa)(\Theta\Delta C_{\max})^2}, \tag{3.3}$$

then every trajectory of (3.1) with an initial state $z(0) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu)$ satisfies $z(T) \in \mathscr{R}_2(\mu)$

Proof. We prove this lemma in a manner similar to that of Lemma 1 in [3].
For every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, the time derivative of $z^\top P_p z$ along the trajectories of the system (3.1) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}(z^\top P_p z) &= -z^\top Q_p z + 2 z^\top P_p \hat{L}_p (q_\mu(y) - y) \\ &\le -\lambda_{\min}(Q_p)|z|^2 + 2\|P_p \hat{L}_p\| \cdot |z| \cdot |q_\mu(y) - y| \\ &\le -\underline{\lambda}_Q |z|^2 + 2 \max_{p \in P} \|P_p \hat{L}_p\| \cdot |z| \cdot |q_\mu(y) - y| \\ &= -\underline{\lambda}_Q |z| (|z| - \Theta |q_\mu(y) - y|). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, since $|y| = |C_p x| \le C_{\max}|z|$, it follows from (2.3) that,

$$C_{\max}|z| \le M\mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad |q_\mu(y) - y| \le \Delta\mu.$$

Hence (3.4) shows

$$\begin{aligned}&\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa)\mu \le |z| \le \frac{M\mu}{C_{\max}} \\ &\Rightarrow \quad \frac{d}{dt}(z^\top P_p z) \le -\underline{\lambda}_Q \kappa(1+\kappa)(\Theta\Delta\mu)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

If we define the balls $\mathscr{B}_1(\mu)$ and $\mathscr{B}(\mu)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{B}_1(\mu) &:= \left\{ z : \ |z| \le \frac{M\mu}{C_{\max}} \right\} \\ \mathscr{B}_2(\mu) &:= \left\{ z : \ |z| \le \Theta\Delta(1+\kappa)\mu \right\},\end{aligned}$$

then it follows from (2.10) and (3.2) that

$$\mathscr{B}_2(\mu) \subset \mathscr{R}_2(\mu,p) \subset \mathscr{R}_1(\mu,p) \subset \mathscr{B}_1(\mu)$$

for $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Thus (3.5) implies that $\mathscr{R}_1(\mu,p)$ and $\mathscr{R}_2(\mu,p)$ are invariant sets of the trajectories of (3.1).
Also, the upper bound in (3.5) shows that if $x(0) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu,p)$, then $x(T) \in \mathscr{R}_2(\mu,p)$ for T satisfying (3.3). □

We use the next result on average dwell time for the finite-time estimation of the state at the "zooming-out" stage. Such estimation is needed for Lyapunov stability of the closed-loop system.

Lemma 3.2. *Fix an initial time $\tau_0 \ge 0$. Suppose that σ satisfies (2.2). Let $\tau \in (0, \tau_a)$, and choose an integer N so that*

$$N > \frac{\tau_a}{\tau_a - \tau}\left(N_0 - \frac{\tau}{\tau_a}\right). \tag{3.6}$$

Then there exists a nonnegative real number $T \le (N-1)\tau$ such that $N_\sigma(\tau_0 + T + \tau, \tau_0 + T) = 0$.

Proof. Let us denote the switching times by $t_1, t_2, \ldots$, and fix an integer $N \geq 1$. Suppose

$$N_\sigma(\tau_0 + T + \tau, \tau_0 + T) > 0 \tag{3.7}$$

for $T \leq (N-1)\tau$. Then we have $t_k - t_{k-1} \leq \tau$ for $k = 1, \ldots, N$, where $t_0 := \tau_0$. Indeed, if

$$t_k - t_{k-1} > \tau \tag{3.8}$$

for some k and if we let $\bar{k}$ be the smallest integer k satisfying (3.8), then we obtain $t_{\bar{k}-1} - \tau_0 \leq (\bar{k}-1)\tau$ and $N_\sigma(t_{\bar{k}-1} + \tau, t_{\bar{k}-1}) = 0$, which contradicts (3.7). Hence for $0 < \epsilon \leq t_1$,

$$t_N - (t_1 - \epsilon) = \sum_{k=2}^{N} (t_k - t_{k-1}) + \epsilon \leq (N-1)\tau + \epsilon$$

It follows from (2.2) that

$$N = N_\sigma(t_N, t_1 - \epsilon) \leq N_0 + \frac{t_N - (t_1 - \epsilon)}{\tau_a} \leq N_0 + \frac{(N-1)\tau + \epsilon}{\tau_a}.$$

Therefore N satisfies the following inequality:

$$N \leq \frac{\tau_a}{\tau_a - \tau} \left(N_0 - \frac{\tau - \epsilon}{\tau_a} \right). \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\epsilon \in (0, t_1)$ was arbitrary, (3.9) is equivalent to

$$N \leq \frac{\tau_a}{\tau_a - \tau} \left(N_0 - \frac{\tau}{\tau_a} \right). \tag{3.10}$$

Thus we have shown that if (3.7) holds for all $T \leq (N-1)\tau$, then N satisfies (3.10). The contraposition of this statement gives a desired result. □

3.1 The proof for convergence to the origin

Define Γ by

$$\Gamma = \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \|A_p\|.$$

We split the proof into two stages: the "zooming-out" and "zooming-in" stages.

3.1.1 *The "Zooming-out" stage*

Set the control input $u = 0$, and fix $\bar{\tau} > 0$ and $\chi > 0$. Then increase μ in the following way: $\mu(t) = 1$ for $t \in [0, \bar{\tau})$, $\mu(t) = e^{(1+\chi)k\Gamma\bar{\tau}}$ for $t \in [k\bar{\tau}, (k+1)\bar{\tau})$ and $k = 1, 2, \ldots$.

Choose $\tau \in (0, \tau_a)$, and suppose that we observe

$$|q_{\mu(t)}(y(t))| \leq M\mu(t) - \Delta\mu(t), \tag{3.11}$$

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma(t_0) =: p \tag{3.12}$$

for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \tau)$. First we shall describe how to determine $\mu(t_0 + \tau)$ after this observation, and next we shall prove the existence of such $t_0 \geq 0$.

Define the observability Gramian $W_p(\tau)$ by

$$W_p(\tau) := \int_0^\tau e^{A_p^\top t} C_p^\top C_p e^{A_p t} dt$$

and the estimated state $\xi(t_0)$ by

$$\xi(t_0) := W_p(\tau)^{-1} \int_0^\tau e^{A_p^\top t} C_p^\top q_{\mu(t_0+t)}(y(t_0 + t)) dt \tag{3.13}$$

Since $u(t) = 0$, we also have

$$x(t_0) = W_p(\tau)^{-1} \int_0^\tau e^{A_p^\top t} C_p^\top y(t_0 + t) dt. \tag{3.14}$$

Moreover, if (3.11) holds, then (2.4) gives

$$|y(t)| \le M\mu(t) \qquad (t_0 \le t < t_0 + \tau),$$

and hence

$$|q_{\mu(t)}(y(t)) - y(t)| \le \Delta\mu(t) \qquad (t_0 \le t < t_0 + \tau).$$

Therefore (3.13) and (3.14) show that

$$|x(t_0) - \xi(t_0)| \le \|W_p(\tau)^{-1}\| \tau \Lambda_p^C(\tau) \Delta\mu^-(t_0 + \tau),$$

where

$$\Lambda_p^C(\tau) := \max_{0 \le t \le \tau} \left\| C_p e^{A_p t} \right\|$$
$$\mu^-(t_0 + \tau) := \lim_{t \nearrow t_0 + \tau} \mu(t).$$

Since $x(t_0 + \tau) = e^{A_p \tau} x(t_0)$, if we set

$$\xi(t_0 + \tau) = e^{A_p \tau} \xi(t_0), \tag{3.15}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &|x(t_0 + \tau) - \xi(t_0 + \tau)| \\ &\quad \le \|W_p(\tau)^{-1}\| \tau \Lambda_p^C(\tau) \left\| e^{A_p \tau} \right\| \Delta\mu^-(t_0 + \tau) =: e(t_0 + \tau). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |z(t_0 + \tau)| &\le |x(t_0 + \tau)| + |x(t_0 + \tau) - \xi(t_0 + \tau)| \\ &\le |\xi(t_0 + \tau)| + 2|x(t_0 + \tau) - \xi(t_0 + \tau)| \\ &\le |\xi(t_0 + \tau)| + 2e(t_0 + \tau) =: E(t_0 + \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we choose $\mu(t_0 + \tau)$ so that

$$\mu(t_0 + \tau) \ge \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\lambda}_P}{\underline{\lambda}_P}} \frac{C_{\max}}{M} E(t_0 + \tau), \tag{3.16}$$

then $z(t_0 + \tau) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu(t_0 + \tau), \sigma(t_0 + \tau))$.

It remains to prove the existence of $t_0 \ge 0$ satisfying (3.11) and (3.12) for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \tau)$. By the definition of μ and (2.12), there is $\tau_0 \ge 0$ such that

$$|y(t)| \le M\mu(t) - 2\Delta\mu(t) \qquad (t \ge \tau_0).$$

In conjunction with (2.3), this implies that (3.11) holds for $t \ge \tau_0$. Let N be an integer satisfying (3.6). Then Lemma 3.2 guarantees the existence of $t_0 \in [\tau_0, \tau_0 + (N-1)\tau]$ such that (3.12) holds for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \tau)$.

3.1.2 *The "Zooming-in" stage*

Choose κ so that (3.2) holds, and define $T_0 := t_0 + \tau$. We consider (2.7) with $\xi(T_0)$ calculated by (3.13) and (3.15). The discussion above ensures $z(T_0) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_0), \sigma(T_0))$. Fix T so that (3.3) is satisfied.

Let us first investigate the case without switching on the interval $(T_0, T_0 + T]$. In this case, if we let $\mu(t) = \mu(T_0)$ for $t \in [T_0, T_0 + T)$, then Lemma 3.1 shows that $z(T_0 + T) \in \mathscr{R}_2(\mu(T_0), \sigma(T_0))$. Define Ω by

$$\Omega := \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\lambda}_P}{\underline{\lambda}_P}} \frac{\Theta\Delta(1 + \kappa) C_{\max}}{M}, \tag{3.17}$$

and set $\mu(T_0+T)=\Omega\mu(T_0)$. Then we obtain $z(T_0+T)\in\mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_0+T),\sigma(T_0+T))$. Note that $\Omega<1$ by (2.12). As regards after T_0+T, if switching does not occur on the interval $(T_0+mT,T_0+(m+1)T]$ for $m=1,2\dots$, then we update μ in the same way.

We now study the switched case. Let $T_1,T_2,\dots,T_n$ be switching times on the interval $(T_0,T_0+T]$. We sometimes write T_{n+1} rather than T_0+T for simplicity of notation. Suppose that for every $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}$ with $p_1\neq p_2$, there exists $c_{p_2,p_1}>0$ such that

$$z^\top P_{p_1}z\le c_{p_2,p_1}\cdot z^\top P_{p_2}z. \tag{3.18}$$

for all $z\in\mathbb{R}^{2\mathsf{n}}$. We adjust μ at every switching time in the following way:

$$\mu(t)=\sqrt{\prod_{\ell=0}^{k-1}c_{\sigma(T_{\ell+1}),\sigma(T_\ell)}}\cdot\mu(T_0)\qquad(T_k\le t<T_{k+1})$$

for $k=0,\dots,n$.

Lemma 3.1 suggests that $\mathscr{R}_i(\mu(T_k),\sigma(T_k))$ $(i=1,2)$ are invariant sets for $t\in[T_k,T_{k+1})$, $k=0,\dots,n$. Moreover, by (3.18), if $z(t)\in\mathscr{R}_i(\mu_0,p_1)$ for some μ_0, then $z(t)\in\mathscr{R}_i(\sqrt{c_{p_2,p_1}}\mu_0,p_2)$ $(i=1,2)$ for $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}$ with $p_1\neq p_2$. Hence it follows that $z(t)\in\mathscr{R}_1(\mu(t),\sigma(t))$ for $t\in[T_0,T_{n+1})$. Also, if there is $t_1\in[T_0,T_{n+1})$ such that $x(t_1)\in\mathscr{R}_2(\mu(t_1),\sigma(t_1))$, then $z(t)\in\mathscr{R}_2(\mu(t),\sigma(t))$ for all $t\in[t_1,T_{n+1})$. To see the existence of such t_1, suppose for a contradiction that

$$z(t)\notin\mathscr{R}_2(\mu(t),\sigma(t)),\qquad(T_0\le t<T_{n+1}). \tag{3.19}$$

First we examine the case $T_{n+1}>T_n$. Since a Filippov solution is (absolutely) continuous, it follows from (3.19) that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{n+1}}z^\top P_{\sigma(t)}z\ge\overline{\lambda}_P(\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa))^2\mu(T_n)^2. \tag{3.20}$$

On the other hand, since $z(t)\in\mathscr{B}_1(\mu(t))$ and $z(t)\notin\mathscr{B}_2(\mu(t))$ for $t<T_{n+1}$, (3.5) shows that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_1}z^\top P_{\sigma(t)}z\le\frac{\underline{\lambda}_PM^2\mu(T_0)^2}{C_{\max}^2}-(T_1-T_0)\underline{\lambda}_Q\kappa(1+\kappa)(\Theta\Delta\mu(T_0))^2,$$

and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}z^\top P_{\sigma(T_1)}z&\le c_{\sigma(T_1),\sigma(T_0)}\cdot\left(\lim_{t\nearrow T_1}z^\top P_{\sigma(t)}z\right)\\&=\left(\frac{\underline{\lambda}_PM^2}{C_{\max}^2}-(T_1-T_0)\underline{\lambda}_Q\kappa(1+\kappa)(\Theta\Delta)^2\right)\mu(T_1)^2.\end{aligned}$$

If we repeat this process and use (3.3), then

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{n+1}}z^\top P_{\sigma(t)}z\le\left(\frac{\underline{\lambda}_PM^2}{C_{\max}^2}-T\underline{\lambda}_Q\kappa(1+\kappa)(\Theta\Delta)^2\right)\mu(T_n)^2<\overline{\lambda}_P(\Theta\Delta(1+\kappa))^2\mu(T_n)^2, \tag{3.21}$$

which contradicts (3.20). Hence we obtain

$$z(T_{n+1})=\lim_{t\nearrow T_0+T}z(t)\in\mathscr{R}_2(\mu(T_n),\sigma(T_n)). \tag{3.22}$$

In the case $T_{n+1}=T_n$, (3.20) and (3.21) hold with T_{n-1} in place of T_n, and then we have

$$\begin{aligned}z(T_{n+1})&=\lim_{t\nearrow T_{n+1}}z(t)\\&\in\mathscr{R}_2(\mu(T_{n-1}),\sigma(T_{n-1}))\\&\subset\mathscr{R}_2(\sqrt{c_{\sigma(T_n),\sigma(T_{n-1})}}\cdot\mu(T_{n-1}),\sigma(T_n)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus if n switches occur, then we set

$$\mu(T_0+T)=\Omega\sqrt{\prod_{\ell=0}^{n-1}c_{\sigma(T_{\ell+1}),\sigma(T_\ell)}}\cdot\mu(T_0).$$

The discussion above implies $z(T_0+T) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_0+T), \sigma(T_0+T))$. We update μ in the same way after T_0+T.

Finally, define

$$c := \max_{p_1 \neq p_2} c_{p_2,p_1}. \tag{3.23}$$

Then (2.2) gives

$$\mu(T_0+mT) \leq \Omega^m \sqrt{c^{N_\sigma(T_0+mT,T_0)}}\mu(T_0) \leq \sqrt{c^{N_0}} \cdot \left(\Omega\sqrt{c^{T/\tau_a}}\right)^m \mu(T_0) \tag{3.24}$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\Omega\sqrt{\lambda^{T/\tau_a}} < 1$, that is, if the average dwell time τ_a satisfies

$$\tau_a > \frac{\log(c)}{2\log(1/\Omega)}T, \tag{3.25}$$

then $\lim_{m\to\infty} \mu(T_0+mT) = 0$. Since $x(t) \in \mathscr{B}_1(\mu(t))$ for $t \geq T_0$, we obtain $\lim_{t\to\infty} x(t) = 0$. ■

Remark 3.3. (a) The proposed method of adjusting μ is causal but sensitive to the time-delay of the switching signal at the "zooming-in" stage. To allow such a delay, we must examine the bound of an error due to the mismatch of modes between the plant and the controller. However we do not proceed along this line to avoid technical issues.

(b) Here we have changed μ at every switching time in the "zooming-in" stage. If we would not, switching might lead to instability of the closed-loop system. Without adjustment of μ, the quantizer does not saturate right after the switch, because the trajectory belongs to $\mathscr{B}_1(\mu)$. However, $\mathscr{B}_1(\mu)$ is not an invariant set, so if we do not change μ, the trajectory may leave $\mathscr{B}_1(\mu)$. This leads to saturation of the quantizer.

3.2 The proof for Lyapunov stability

The proof of Lyapunov stability follows in a line similar to that in Sec. 5.5 of [6].

Let us denote by $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$ the open ball with center at the origin and radius ε in $\mathbb{R}^{2\mathsf{n}\times 2\mathsf{n}}$. In what follows, we use the letters in the previous subsection and assume that (3.25) holds.

Let $\delta > 0$ be small enough to satisfy

$$C_{\max} e^{\Gamma N\tau}\delta < \Delta_0. \tag{3.26}$$

Then $q_{\mu(t)}(y(t)) = 0$ for $t \in [0, N\tau]$. The argument on the existence of t_0 at the "zooming-out" stage implies that the time T_0, at which the stage changes from "zooming-out" to "zooming-in", satisfies $T_0 \leq N\tau$ for every switching signal.

Fix $\alpha > 0$. By (3.13), $\xi(T_0) = 0$, and hence we see from (3.16) that $\mu(T_0)$ achieving $z(T_0) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_0), \sigma(T_0))$ can be chosen so that

$$\alpha \leq \mu(T_0) \leq \bar{\mu}, \tag{3.27}$$

where $\bar{\mu}$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mu} := \max\left\{\alpha,\ \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\lambda}_P}{\underline{\lambda}_P}}\frac{\Delta\tau C_{\max} e^{(1+\chi)\lfloor N\tau/\bar{\tau}\rfloor\Gamma\bar{\tau}}}{M} \times \max_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\|W_p(\tau)^{-1}\|\Lambda_p^C(\tau)\left\|e^{A_p\tau}\right\|\right)\right\}.$$

Note that $\bar{\mu}$ is independent on switching signals.

By (3.24), if m satisfies

$$m > \frac{\log(\bar{\mu}M\sqrt{c^{N_0}}/(\varepsilon C_{\max}))}{\log(1/(\Omega\sqrt{c^{T/\tau_a}}))}, \tag{3.28}$$

then we have

$$\mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_0+mT), \sigma(T_0+mT)) \subset \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon. \tag{3.29}$$

Let $\bar{m}$ be the smallest integer satisfying (3.28).

Define $T_1 := T_0 + \bar{m}T \leq N\tau + \bar{m}T$ and

$$\underline{c} := \min_{p_1\neq p_2} c_{p_2,p_1}.$$

By (3.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(t) &\geq \Omega^{\bar{m}}\sqrt{\underline{c}^{N_0+\bar{m}T/\tau_a}}\mu(T_0)\\ &\geq \alpha\Omega^{\bar{m}}\sqrt{\underline{c}^{N_0+\bar{m}T/\tau_a}} =: \eta.\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

for $t \in [T_0, T_1]$. Let $\delta > 0$ satisfy

$$C_{\max} e^{\Gamma(N\tau + \bar{m}T)} \delta < \eta \Delta_0 \tag{3.31}$$

$$e^{\Gamma(N\tau + \bar{m}T)} \delta < \min \left\{ \varepsilon, \quad \sqrt{\frac{\underline{\lambda}_P}{\bar{\lambda}_P}} \frac{M\eta}{C_{\max}} \right\}. \tag{3.32}$$

By (3.30) and (3.31), $q_{\mu(t)}(y(t)) = 0$ on the interval $[0, T_1]$, so $\xi(t) = 0$ and $u(t) = 0$ on the same interval. Combining this with (3.32), we obtain $|x(t)| \le e^{\Gamma(N\tau + \bar{m}T)} \delta < \varepsilon$ for $t \le T_1$. Thus

$$|z(t)| \le |x(t)| + |\xi(t)| < \varepsilon \qquad (t \le T_1). \tag{3.33}$$

On the other hand, by (3.30) and (3.32),

$$\begin{aligned} z(T_1)^\top P_{\sigma(T_1)} z(T_1) &\le \lambda_{\max}(P_{\sigma(T_1)}) |z(T_1)|^2 \\ &< \frac{\underline{\lambda}_P M^2 \eta^2}{C_{\max}^2} \le \frac{\underline{\lambda}_P M^2 \mu(T_1)^2}{C_{\max}^2} \end{aligned}$$

for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence $z(T_1) \in \mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_1), \sigma(T_1)) \subset \mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$ by (3.29). In addition, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(T_1 + kT) &\le \sqrt{c^{N_0}} \cdot \left(\Omega \sqrt{c^{T/\tau_a}} \right)^{\bar{m}+k} \mu(T_0) \\ &\le \sqrt{c^{N_0}} \cdot \left(\Omega \sqrt{c^{T/\tau_a}} \right)^{\bar{m}} \bar{\mu} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \ge 0$ and since $\bar{m}$ satisfies (3.28), it follows that that $\mathscr{R}_1(\mu(T_1 + kT), \sigma(T_1 + kT))$ also lies in $\mathscr{B}_\varepsilon$. Since $\mathscr{R}_1(\mu(t), \sigma(t))$ is an invariant set for $t \ge T_0$, we have

$$|z(t)| < \varepsilon \qquad (t \ge T_1). \tag{3.34}$$

From (3.33) and (3.34), we see that Lyapunov stability can be achieved. ■

Remark 3.4. Through Lemma 3.2, we implicitly use the average dwell time property to obtain the upper bound $\bar{\mu}$ in (3.27).

4 Numerical Examples

Consider the continuous-time switched system (2.7) with the following two modes:

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As the feedback gain and the observar gain of each mode, we take

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \ L_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \ L_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let the quantizer q be uniform-type, and define the parameters M and Δ of the quantizer by $M = 20$, $\Delta = 0.1$, Also, define Q_1 and Q_2 in (2.9) and κ in (3.2) by $Q_1 = \mathrm{diag}(2, 8, 2, 8)$, $Q_2 = \mathrm{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1)$, $\kappa = 2.5$, where $\mathrm{diag}(e_1, \ldots, e_4)$ means a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements starting in the upper left corner are $e_1, \ldots, e_4$. Then we obtain $T \approx 2.20$ in (3.3), $\Omega \approx 0.824$ in (3.17), $c \approx 4.03$ in (3.23), and $\tau_a \approx 7.90$ in (3.25).

Fig. 2 (a) and (b) show that the output y and the ℓ^2-norm of the state x of the switched system (2.1) with $x(0) = [-6 \quad 5]^\top$ and $\mu(0) = 1$. In this example, the "zooming-out" stage finished at $t = 0.5$. We see the non-smooth behaviors of y and x at the switching times $t = 5, 20, 28, 36$. In particular, we observe from the behaviors of x at $t = 5, 28$ that, not surprisingly, adjustments of μ at some swithcing times are conservative.



(a) The output y.



(b) The ℓ^2-norm of the state x.

Figure 2: Simulation with $x(0) = [-6\ 5]^\top$ and $\sigma(0) = 1$.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The stabilization of continuous-time switched linear systems by quantized output feedback has been studied. We have proposed an output encoding method for globally asymptotic stability. The encoding method is rooted in the non-switched case, and an additional adjustment of the zoom parameter is needed at every switching time in the zooming-in stage. We have discussed the effect of switching by using multiple Lyapunov functions and an average dwell time assumption.

References

[1] H. Ishii and B. A. Francis, *Limited Data Rate in Control Systems with Networks.* Lecture Notes on Control and Information Science, Vol. 275, Berlin: Springer, 2002.

[2] R. W. Brockett and D. Liberzon, "Quantized feedback stabilization of linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, vol. 45, pp. 1279–1289, 2000.

[3] D. Liberzon, "Hybrid feedback stabilization of systems with quantized signals," *Automatica*, vol. 39, pp. 1543–1554, 2003.

[4] S. Asuma and T. Sugie, "Optimal dynamic quantizers for discrete-valued input control," *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 396–406, 2008.

[5] D. Liberzon, "On stabilization of linear systems with limited information," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, vol. 48, pp. 304–307, 2003.

[6] ——, "Finite data-rate feedback stabilization of switched and hybrid linear systems," 2013, to appear in *Automatica*.

[7] G. N. Nair, S. Dey, and R. J. Evans, "Infinmum data rates for stabilising markov jump linear systems," in *Proc. 42nd IEEE CDC*, 2003.

[8] C. Zhang, K. Chen, and G. E. Dullerud, "Stabilization of marmarkov jump linear systems with limited information–a convex approach," in *Proc. ACC 2009*, 2009.

[9] Q. Ling and H. Lin, "Necessary and sufficient bit rate conditions to stabilize quantized markov jump lineaer systems," in *Proc. ACC 2010*, 2010.

[10] J. P. Hespanha and A. S. Morse, "Stability of swithched systems with average dwell-time," in *Proc. 38th IEEE CDC*, 1999.

[11] D. Liberzon and D. Nešić, "Input-to-state stabilization of linear systems with quantized state measurement," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, vol. 52, pp. 767–781, 2007.

[12] D. Liberzon, *Switching in Systems and Control*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003.

[13] A. F. Filippov, *Differential Equations with Discontinuous Rgihthand Sides*. Dordrecht, The Netherlans: Kluwer, 1988.

[14] J. Cortés, "Discontinuous dynamical systems," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 28, pp. 36–73, 2008.

[15] E. Skafidas, R. J. Evans, A. V. Savkin, and I. R. Petersen, "Stability results for switched controller systems," *Automatica*, vol. 35, pp. 553–564, 1999.